

that the marriage tie would be less permanent under these circumstances. What makes a man disloyal to his wife and vice versa, is not any depravity of heart on either part, but simply the fact that the sanction of the heart has been superseded in its increase by that of the civil power. The heart, if left to itself, is always loyal. It is only when some lesser sanction is invoked, and the heart feels itself constrained and disowned, that it seeks in new fields the restlessness of its supremacy. The heart is of a truly divine depth, and you need not fear its exhaustion by any possible demands you can make upon it. Leave the heart, therefore, sole legislator in the realm of marriage, and we shall soon see that realm exonerated of its present monstrous iniquities.

But if this be the case, that is to say, if freedom of divorce be found practical to promote the permanence of marriage, then the fear which society now entertains of being overwhelmed with the charge of the rising generation, confuses itself unreasonably.

The sentiment of paternalism in the community will remain unawakened, rather it will become enhanced, and more than ever should society assume a responsibility which it is unprepared to meet. At all events, I am persuaded that society needs only limit the freedom of divorce by a regard to the interests of children, exacting from those who seek it the most rigid and ample guarantees in that behalf, in order to see marriage emerging from the mire and slime of the earth into which it is now sunk, and putting on once more the stances sanctity which deems it fit to heaven.

But I hear you saying in reply to all this, the depravity of our passions. You say, substantially, in your comment upon my former paper, that our passions are so depraved and perverted as to furnish an unsafe code to action. Had I space now I should like to show you how fallacious and inconsiderate all this doctrine is, but I must defer the service to another communication.

Since your types have a will of their own, I will follow their lead as conveyed in the signature of my former paper, by now subscribing myself, as I did not then,

Remarks.

We have told our correspondent already that we deny his right to apply the term Marriage to any such arrangement as he contemplates. We thoroughly understand, if he does not, that words are things, and we insist on their use only in their established and conceded acceptations. Webster defines marriage to be "the act of uniting a man and woman for life; wedlock; the legal union of a man and woman for life," and adds, "Marriage is a contract, both civil and religious, by which the parties engage to live together in mutual affection and fidelity till death shall separate them."

Now what our correspondent contends for may be even much better, but it is not Marriage, and he has no right so to characterize it.

His assertion that "the freedom of Divorce will be found practically to promote the permanence of Marriage" is entitled to all the weight which a mere assertion, in defiance of the common sense of mankind and the uniform attestations of History, should carry. Gibbons speaks of a Roman matron, after free divorce was established in Rome, having eight husbands in five years, and remarks that the sentiment of Chastity could not be very strong under such circumstances—self-evident deduction which will have weight with good many, however lightly regarded by our correspondent. He says, too, that the licentiousness thus induced had a fearful influence in producing and accelerating the corruption and downfall of Rome. Why should we not give heed to the teachings of authentic History rather than the unsupported averments of Speculation?

In all ages, in all countries, some have acted as our correspondent reasons, and formed sexual unions to last only during mutual consent. These have been formed and have existed side by side with unions for life, such as the Law recognizes and Society honors by the name of Marriage. Now if any body chooses seriously to contend that the legal unions have not in the average subsisted far longer and produced more happiness than the other sort, he is quite welcome to do so without reply from us; for we know that not one in a hundred can be made to believe him.

We think there can be no rigid and ample guarantee for the due care and training of children, where the unions of their parents are impelled and prolonged by mutual attraction only. In other words, we believe that, under such a system, the proportion of unions impelled by mere appetite without esteem and confidence, far less affection, would be immensely greater than now. There are thousands of plausible and well appearing libertines who would gladly marry every pretty face they meet if they could be divorced and set at liberty to marry again by merely willing it. Fifty years of this would make the earth a Sodom.

HORACE GREELEY.
Industrial Congress.

The Boston Protective Union has the following letter from L. A. Hine of Cincinnati, Ohio, where the last Industrial Congress was held. [We like the name highly, it reminds us that there is a Congress to which the prefix could not with any shadow of propriety be given.] Mr. Hine recites several important and sweeping principles as those of the Congress, meaning (we presume), those of a majority of the callers. As it is a "free meeting, those who hold quite different views will be at home in it, if devoted to the general idea of Reform and Progress.

COMBS, 304 BROADWAY, March 8, 1850.
PROFESSOR.—Allow me to call attention, through The Protective Union, to the Fifth Industrial Congress, which is to assemble in Chicago, on the 2d Wednesday of June next.

There is an organization which has the interests of labor for its object and advocates certain reforms as essential to the greatest welfare of the toiler. These doctrines are:

1. Labor produces all things not supplied by Nature, and the toiler should possess all things.

2. Capital is the result of labor, and, when possessed by those who have not obtained it as the reward of their own industry, is a curse.

3. Capital has no right to prey upon labor by the extraction of interest and profits.

4. Laws for the collection of debt should be repealed, and criminal codes reformed.

5. Society has no right to dought but good to any human being.

6. The basis of human redemption is the discovery and reception of truth, and the moral elevation of the people.

To Education must the principal hope for emancipation be given, as the best means of direct instruction as well as to the enjoyment of happiness; therefore, every child has a right to a thorough education at the expense of society.

7. Peace and war—harmony and not antagonism—is the natural state of man; therefore, war should be suppressed.

8. The Earth belongs to all mankind, and to each one as much as to any other, and no more than his support and welfare demand.

9. The public domain should be set apart for the free use, in limited quantities, of those who desire to cultivate the earth and all others as much as they need for home.

10. No one should be permitted to monopolize the land anywhere, and the legislatures should provide for the reduction of large estates to such limits as are consistent with the general welfare of the people.

11. The homestead should be exempted from all forced sale, and held sacred to the free use of the family.

These Ed. Eds. are some of the leading doctrines strongly advocated by the Industrial Congress. They cannot be fully explained here, but the reader will find them in the men around us, schooled and trained as they have been. Let each question come up in its own place and order.

(Ed. Tr.)

Hanging and Slave-Catching.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

I am confident that you made a woful mistake in your choice of words this morning, in your paragraph in relation to Dr. Webster, when you said that though anxious that the law authorizing Hanging should be repealed, you were in favor of having existing laws relating thereto strictly enforced. This is undoubtedly the correct doctrine, but it can hardly have three weeks since you strongly advocated the opposite, viz., that the constitutional provision and the law providing for the capture and return of fugitive slaves should be disregarded by all human citizens. For myself, I cannot distinguish other from which in these matters, I am strongly opposed to hanging as the punishment, but do not oppose the law on the track of justice, as far as it goes, but the law is plain and explicit on both points, and it is not easy for me to determine which should be observed and which disregarded. When voting comes, I will stand with you toward the removal of all laws and regulations which interfere with the right of all good citizens to render a faithful service to the country, while they remain on the statute book, it is not the duty of all good citizens to render a faithful service to them!

New York, April 3, 1850.

Remarks.

That the eagerness of some people to pick other people up, sometimes induces the farmer to set about it before the latter are down, was observed by a Roman Consul or somebody else, a good while ago. Our correspondent furnishes a new illustration of the fact.

We have never purposed to offer physical resistance either to Hanging or Slave-Catching. Certainly, deeming both wrong, we would not have either forbore so long as the Law shall require it. The Constitution says fugitive slaves shall be delivered up to their masters; and, on due proof of their identity, we make no opposition. We would not have the slaveholders waive their legal rights; let them come here, hunt up and identify their slaves, and we shall never resist any legal regularization. The more they hunt among us, the sooner (in our judgment) slavery will come to an end. But we deny that the Constitution orders us to hunt runaway negroes, any more than the Law requires us to hang malefactors. And we decidedly object to any new enactments intended to increase the rigors either of Slave-catching or Hanging. Let Shylock have his pound of flesh so long as the Law doth give it; but not one hair's breadth beyond the Law's clear requirement.

[Ed. Tr.]

AN ASTONISHING INVENTION.—The London Morning Journal says, in a review shortly to be brought before the public a new locomotive, in which the requirements of either steam, fire, air, or water, will be dispensed with. Its power of traction, while effective, will be perfectly safe, and will be equal to that of a team of twenty horses. This agent will exert a powerful influence on all nations. Doubtless parts of the world, where steamships from the expense of fuel, have not been able to reach nations by a larger scale than over steam has yet advanced.

NORTH CAROLINA.—The Whigs of this State will hold a Convention in Raleigh, on the 18th of June, to nominate a candidate for Governor.

THE Louisiana Legislature, during its recent session, passed 353 bills, of which upward of 200 were put through in the last week.

Our Nation of Tobacco.

SOME years ago, the Mississ. Powers asked the Editor of The Tribune for a written statement of his opinion of the use and effects of tobacco, which was given. Finding the letter in a neat twenty-five cent book just issued by them entitled "Tobacco—Its History, Nature and Effects on the Body and Mind," by José Snow, M.D., with the Opinions of Dr. Nott, Rev. H. W. Beecher, &c. &c. and finding it to express representations similar to those of the author of The Tribune, Mr. Whitney has received the glory of the undertaking. I will not dispute, but that he ought to have done so, and that the idea, there is, I think, some ground for question.

In April, 1848, Mr. Jonathan T. Warner, a native of Lynn, Mass., arrived in this country, after a residence of ten years in California. I have in my possession the original manuscript of an address delivered by him in this place, in September of that year. On the climate, soil and resources of California, and the advantages to be derived by the United States in possessing that country. In this address he argues the absurdities of a "King of California" and goes on to argue the advantages which such a communication would have on the Pacific route. Hope, California, is the name of the town, transferring the name of the city of San Francisco, to the shores of the Pacific and China. Some addresses were sold by Springer in Rochester, N. Y., and other places.

Mr. Warner corresponded with great interest in various parts of the country, and was greatly pleased when he came to New York. His Lynn and J.W. Smith, and at that time Members of the United States Senate. He visited Washington several times during his stay in the United States, and convinced Hon. Mr. Foote of the time necessary to be given to the consideration of the subject. He also addressed the Legislature of California, and was received with great cordiality by which it was passed.

Mr. Whitney has received the glory of the undertaking, but the idea, there is, I think, some ground for question.

In April, 1848, Mr. Jonathan T. Warner, a native of Lynn, Mass., arrived in this country, after a residence of ten years in California. I have in my possession the original manuscript of an address delivered by him in this place, in September of that year.

On the climate, soil and resources of California, and the advantages to be derived by the United States in possessing that country. In this address he argues the absurdities of a "King of California" and goes on to argue the advantages which such a communication would have on the Pacific route.

Hope, California, is the name of the town, transferring the name of the city of San Francisco, to the shores of the Pacific and China. Some addresses were sold by Springer in Rochester, N. Y., and other places.

Mr. Warner corresponded with great interest in various parts of the country, and was greatly pleased when he came to New York. His Lynn and J.W. Smith, and at that time Members of the United States Senate. He visited Washington several times during his stay in the United States, and convinced Hon. Mr. Foote of the time necessary to be given to the consideration of the subject. He also addressed the Legislature of California, and was received with great cordiality by which it was passed.

Mr. Whitney has received the glory of the undertaking, but the idea, there is, I think, some ground for question.

In April, 1848, Mr. Jonathan T. Warner, a native of Lynn, Mass., arrived in this country, after a residence of ten years in California. I have in my possession the original manuscript of an address delivered by him in this place, in September of that year.

On the climate, soil and resources of California, and the advantages to be derived by the United States in possessing that country. In this address he argues the absurdities of a "King of California" and goes on to argue the advantages which such a communication would have on the Pacific route.

Hope, California, is the name of the town, transferring the name of the city of San Francisco, to the shores of the Pacific and China. Some addresses were sold by Springer in Rochester, N. Y., and other places.

Mr. Warner corresponded with great interest in various parts of the country, and was greatly pleased when he came to New York. His Lynn and J.W. Smith, and at that time Members of the United States Senate. He visited Washington several times during his stay in the United States, and convinced Hon. Mr. Foote of the time necessary to be given to the consideration of the subject. He also addressed the Legislature of California, and was received with great cordiality by which it was passed.

Mr. Whitney has received the glory of the undertaking, but the idea, there is, I think, some ground for question.

In April, 1848, Mr. Jonathan T. Warner, a native of Lynn, Mass., arrived in this country, after a residence of ten years in California. I have in my possession the original manuscript of an address delivered by him in this place, in September of that year.

On the climate, soil and resources of California, and the advantages to be derived by the United States in possessing that country. In this address he argues the absurdities of a "King of California" and goes on to argue the advantages which such a communication would have on the Pacific route.

Hope, California, is the name of the town, transferring the name of the city of San Francisco, to the shores of the Pacific and China. Some addresses were sold by Springer in Rochester, N. Y., and other places.

Mr. Warner corresponded with great interest in various parts of the country, and was greatly pleased when he came to New York. His Lynn and J.W. Smith, and at that time Members of the United States Senate. He visited Washington several times during his stay in the United States, and convinced Hon. Mr. Foote of the time necessary to be given to the consideration of the subject. He also addressed the Legislature of California, and was received with great cordiality by which it was passed.

Mr. Whitney has received the glory of the undertaking, but the idea, there is, I think, some ground for question.

In April, 1848, Mr. Jonathan T. Warner, a native of Lynn, Mass., arrived in this country, after a residence of ten years in California. I have in my possession the original manuscript of an address delivered by him in this place, in September of that year.

On the climate, soil and resources of California, and the advantages to be derived by the United States in possessing that country. In this address he argues the absurdities of a "King of California" and goes on to argue the advantages which such a communication would have on the Pacific route.

Hope, California, is the name of the town, transferring the name of the city of San Francisco, to the shores of the Pacific and China. Some addresses were sold by Springer in Rochester, N. Y., and other places.

Mr. Warner corresponded with great interest in various parts of the country, and was greatly pleased when he came to New York. His Lynn and J.W. Smith, and at that time Members of the United States Senate. He visited Washington several times during his stay in the United States, and convinced Hon. Mr. Foote of the time necessary to be given to the consideration of the subject. He also addressed the Legislature of California, and was received with great cordiality by which it was passed.

Mr. Whitney has received the glory of the undertaking, but the idea, there is, I think, some ground for question.

In April, 1848, Mr. Jonathan T. Warner, a native of Lynn, Mass., arrived in this country, after a residence of ten years in California. I have in my possession the original manuscript of an address delivered by him in this place, in September of that year.

On the climate, soil and resources of California, and the advantages to be derived by the United States in possessing that country. In this address he argues the absurdities of a "King of California" and goes on to argue the advantages which such a communication would have on the Pacific route.

Hope, California, is the name of the town, transferring the name of the city of San Francisco, to the shores of the Pacific and China. Some addresses were sold by Springer in Rochester, N. Y., and other places.

Mr. Warner corresponded with great interest in various parts of the country, and was greatly pleased when he came to New York. His Lynn and J.W. Smith, and at that time Members of the United States Senate. He visited Washington several times during his stay in the United States, and convinced Hon. Mr. Foote of the time necessary to be given to the consideration of the subject. He also addressed the Legislature of California, and was received with great cordiality by which it was passed.

Mr. Whitney has received the glory of the undertaking, but the idea, there is, I think, some ground for question.

In April, 1848, Mr. Jonathan T. Warner, a native of Lynn, Mass., arrived in this country, after a residence of ten years in California. I have in my possession the original manuscript of an address delivered by him in this place, in September of that year.

On the climate, soil and resources of California, and the advantages to be derived by the United States in possessing that country. In this address he argues the absurdities of a "King of California" and goes on to argue the advantages which such a communication would have on the Pacific route.

Hope, California, is the name of the town, transferring the name of the city of San Francisco, to the shores of the Pacific and China. Some addresses were sold by Springer in Rochester, N. Y., and other places.

Mr. Warner corresponded with great interest in various parts of the country, and was greatly pleased when he came to New York. His Lynn and J.W. Smith, and at that time Members of the United States Senate. He visited Washington several times during his stay in the United States, and convinced Hon. Mr. Foote of the time necessary to be given to the consideration of the subject. He also addressed the Legislature of California, and was received with great cordiality by which it was passed.

Mr. Whitney has received the glory of the undertaking, but the idea, there is, I think, some ground for question.

In April, 1848, Mr. Jonathan T. Warner, a native of Lynn, Mass., arrived in this country, after a residence of ten years in California. I have in my possession the original manuscript of an address delivered by him in this place, in September of that year.

On the climate, soil and resources of California, and the advantages to be derived by the United States in possessing that country. In this address he argues the absurdities of a "King of California" and goes on to argue the advantages which such a communication would have on the Pacific route.

Hope, California, is the name of the town, transferring the name of the city of San Francisco, to the shores of the Pacific and China. Some addresses were sold by Springer in Rochester, N. Y., and other places.

Mr. Warner corresponded with great interest in various parts of the country, and was greatly pleased when he came to New York. His Lynn and J.W. Smith, and at that time Members of the United States Senate. He visited Washington several times during his stay in the United States, and convinced Hon. Mr. Foote of the time necessary to be given to the consideration of the subject. He also addressed the Legislature of California, and was received with great cordiality by which it was passed.

Mr. Whitney has received the glory of the undertaking, but the idea, there is, I think, some ground for question.

In April, 1848, Mr. Jonathan T. Warner, a native of Lynn, Mass., arrived in this country, after a residence of ten years in California. I have in my possession the original manuscript of an address delivered by him in this place, in September of that year.

On the climate, soil and resources of California, and the advantages to be derived by the United States in possessing that country. In this address he argues the absurdities of a "King of California" and goes on to argue the advantages which such a communication would have on the Pacific route.

Hope, California, is the name of the town, transferring the name of the city of San Francisco, to the shores of the Pacific and China. Some addresses were sold by Springer in Rochester, N. Y., and other places.

Mr. Warner corresponded with great interest in various parts of the country, and was greatly pleased when he came to New York. His Lynn and J.W. Smith, and at that time Members of the United States Senate. He visited Washington several times during his stay in the United States, and convinced Hon. Mr. Foote of the time necessary to be given to the consideration of the subject. He also addressed the Legislature of California, and was received with great cordiality by which it was passed.

Mr. Whitney has received the glory of the undertaking, but the idea, there is, I think, some ground for question.